

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectively requested in view of the above amendments and these remarks. Claims 1-36 and 38-47 are currently pending.

Claims 1-14, 18-29, 31, 36, 38-42 and 44-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0060896 A9 to Hulai et al. in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2008/0313282 A1 to Warila and further in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0034833 A1 to Kougouris et al. Applicants have reviewed the Office Action, the cited art and in particular Kougouris and respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicants have overcome the rejection of the claims based on United States Patent Application 2002/0085020 A1 to Carroll, Jr. Kougouris has been cited to replace Carroll and is cited as disclosing identifying at least one mapping present in the screen component, the mapping for specifying a relationship between the screen component and the data component as defined by an identifier representing the mapping, selecting the data component mapped by the mapping according to the mapping identifier and generating a screen element from the screen element definition to the format of the data field definition as defined in the mapped data component.

In particular, Applicants traverse that paragraphs [0008]-[0009] describe the “identifying at least one mapping present in the screen component, the mapping for specifying a relationship between the screen component and the data component as defined by an identifier representing the mapping.” In the Office Action, it is stated that the markup language file 102 is interpreted as the screen component, that the dynamic interaction manager 104 is interpreted as mapping mechanism/data binding and that the data management components A/B/C/D 106A-D are interpreted as data component.

The Office Action equates the Kougouris’ description of data binding with Applicants’ claimed mapping. Applicants, however, traverse this interpretation. Kougouris’ definition of data binding is provided in paragraph [0008]-[0009], which states, “Certain application development platforms support the concept of “data binding” with respect to GUI elements defined in markup language. Briefly, the term data

binding, as used herein refers to a relationship in which a GUI element is bound to a data element (emphasis added.)” In the words of the claims, Kougiouris discloses that the screen component is bound to the data component. As stated in Kougiouris, the binding allows a data source to retrieve appropriate data for display on the GUI. Moreover, the data binding supports the automatic transfer of the data to and from the GUI. The claims, however, do not bind one screen component to a data component. The claims also do not retrieve data for display on the GUI. Moreover, there is no automatic transfer of data to and from the GUI. By binding the GUI element to the data element, the two elements are considered to be the same. In other words, an element of the markup language 102 is bound to the data element of the data management components A/B/C/D so that GUI element retrieves the data element.

The claims require that there be a relationship between screen component and the data component and that that relationship is represented by a mapping defined by an identifier. As disclosed on page 11 line 28 to page 12 line 30, the relationship between the screen component and the data component is dynamic and that allow modifications. Thus, as disclosed, modifications made to either the screen component or the data component can be propagated to the other component. Applicants respectfully submit that the Kougiouris’ data binding does not disclose the required relationship between the screen component and the data component. The GUI element and the data element are bound to one another regardless of what happens to the either. Kougiouris’ binding does not permit this modification.

Moreover, the claim requires that the mapping is present in the screen component. According to the Office Action, the mapping is disclosed by the dynamic interaction manager 104. As is evident by FIG. 1, the dynamic interaction manager 104 is a different element from the markup language file 102. As different elements, Kougiouris does not disclose that the mapping is present in the screen component.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Hulai, Warila and Kougiouris does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the limitations of independent claims 1, 18, 36 and 38. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that these independent claims are patentable over the cited combination. As claims 2-14, 18-29, 39-42 and 44-47 depend on these independent claims, Applicants

submit that these claims are patentable over the references for the same reasons. Applicants request that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 35 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hulai in view of Kougouris. As this rejection is based on Kougouris, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 35 and 43 are patentable over the cited references for the same reasons as given above for the other independent claims. Applicants therefore request that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 15-17 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hulai in view of Warila and Kougouris and further in view of United States Patent No. 7,010,573 B1 to Saulpaugh et al. As claims 15-17 and 32-34 dependent on claims 1 and 18, Applicants respectfully submit that they are patentable over the cited references for the reasons given above. Applicants request that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 13 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hulai in view of Warila and Kougouris and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,868,441 to Greene et al. As claims 13 and 30 dependent on claims 1 and 18, Applicants respectfully submit that they are patentable over the cited references for the reasons given above. Applicants request that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

As Applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, Applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Serial No. 10/788,490

Bibr et al

Case No. RIM00025

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to
50-5278.

Respectfully submitted,
Bibr, Viera, et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: **20280**

By: /Simon B. Anolick/

Simon B. Anolick
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 37,585
Telephone: 847-523-2339
Fax: 847-523-2350